

# Opinion

January 23, 1992

THE REBEL YELL

5

## Pro-life makes more sense

by Dennis Monokroussos

In the first part of this series, I critiqued four pro-choice arguments that I feel side-step the first issue in the abortion debate: the personhood of the fetus. In this part, I will discuss arguments in favor of the pro-life position.

The basic pro-life argument is this: (1) one should not kill innocent human beings, (2) the unborn are innocent human beings, and therefore (3) one should not kill the unborn. The unborn are human beings for the reason that they already have the full blueprint of development (DNA) from the moment of their conception. The fact that the unborn are at an earlier stage of development reflects only this, not that they are inhuman.

In response to this, a distinction that has been made by "sophisticated" pro-choice advocates is that there is a distinction between being a "mere" human being and being a hu-

man "person." A "person" is sometimes defined as one who is capable of human interaction, of self-consciousness, communication, and other developed social capacities (functionalism).

Now there are two problems with this view, one in practice, the other in principle. First, it is hard to see how this criterion allows for abortion without allowing for infanticide, or even for killing someone who is in a coma.

A second problem is that the idea of defining living beings on the basis of what they are capable of doing is not a wise one. Does this imply that a 35 year-old university professor is *inherently* more human than a five year-old? Or more accurately, is someone who knows how to play the violin more human than someone who has the potential to learn, but has not yet? Is a white, male Harvard professor *better* than a poor, black, female homemaker?

It seems more reasonable to assert that one's humanity is an essential element that is present from the moment of conception, and hence people develop the potential that is already present. Therefore, the unborn are not potential persons, but persons with potential.

Having presented all of this, what if the pro-choice advocate is still not convinced? Wouldn't it be better for those who don't want abortions to not have any, but to mind their own business and stop trying to impose their morality on those who differ? No. Aside from the obvious argument that one should try to prevent murder (and pro-lifers believe abortion is murder) there is another major problem with that argument.

There are four choices concerning abortion. (1) It is kill-

ing a life and we know it is a life. (2) It is killing a life and we don't know it is a life. (3) It is not killing a life but we don't know that it is not a life. (4) It is not a life and we know it is not a life.

In case one, what occurs is murder. In case four, abortion is justified, and if someone can provide an irrefutable argument that the fetus is definitely not a human life, then abortion may be morally acceptable. In the other two cases, one is

either committing manslaughter or else gross negligence. Let's say that someone is driving, and sees up ahead

something lying in the road. It could be a mannequin, but it might also be an injured human being. Let's suppose the driver agonizes for a while as he approaches the object or person, but finally decides that

since he really isn't too sure that it's a human, and it might be inconvenient to slow down or change lanes, he hits the thing. Now, regardless of what that object turned out to be, the person is obviously morally guilty of gross negligence, at the very least. Yet, this is exactly what the pro-choice movement is in general advocating.

In summary, the pro-life position makes more sense than the pro-choice position since life is determined essentially by: the fact that one is a human because one has the inherent potential, from the time of conception, to develop physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually. Just as an adult is only a more developed human than a child, the fetus is a human (person) at an early stage of development. Also, even if it is ambiguous as to whether or not the fetus represents human life, it would be, at the very least, gross negligence to abort.

**The unborn are not potential persons, but persons with potential.**

## Some kids will never have a funeral

by William Holt

Let's isolate the functions involved with the abortion issue.

First of all, the main objective of the two activist groups, pro-choice vs. pro-life, is to see who gets to force the other to have it their way by means of a Supreme Court decision.

In the end, it won't be a matter of both sides agreeing with each other. It will simply be a matter of how many judges vote in favor of one position

according to which side did the best lobbying and according to how much historical information the court can dig through that will give it the reasons to make a final decision about abortion.

It has become my experience that one nature of any argument is that it never ends, and I think we can assume it will be the same for the abortion debate. But what is it that everyone is really arguing about?

Let's see. It's the industrial

age. Once upon a time, there was a pregnant woman who either hated the father, didn't know where the father was and/or didn't have the resources to raise a kid. She met some character in a dark alley who had designed this clever contraception waiting to use it on his first willing guinea pig. Word got around. Everyone started to use it, and now it's a common practice of professional physicians everywhere.

People have opinions, and the waging of war between choice and life began.

But notice that the arguing takes place after the fact that the only reason any of this exists is due to one basic truth: there have always been enough people in the world who were willing to solve their problems of raising children by mechanically preventing childbirth in the first place.

Looking at the very first consideration that had to have taken place, it looks like people are moving away from the actual problem like a satellite wondering from earth's orbit.

The dilemma does not consist of whose position holds the most water. The choices don't have to do with an individual's

rights or with the ethical concept involved in killing the unborn.

A woman has an abortion because both the world around her and the situation of her own life has created a living hell for her to be able to raise a child. That's the problem.

Therefore, persons concerned with personal freedom and the quality of life on earth would do well instead to form activist groups that lobby politicians, do research and donate money towards an environment healthy enough for any woman/

couple to bear and raise children.

All of the monies used by the thousands of "minority" type groups who are busy trying to prove who has the most rights in the world would be better used to create jobs and the necessary assistance so that the youth of America can have a stable childhood, if any.

Perhaps one day we will find out who has the most right to say and be what. But when will the day come when we find out who has the ability to do anything?

Write us here at *The Rebel Yell* because we would dearly like to hear about whatever you have to say, since you are the students of this university and you have the right to complain and

since we are the newspaper we have the right to print what people and students have to complain about, and if you have read this far then you should go ahead & write us because it doesn't seem like you have much

else to do as in the way of studying for classes or anything of that nature since you would not have read this babbling ramble that is in this box to the end and when you write us letters and we run them, that really means less work for us in the end.



## Top ten ways to spot student spies at UNLV

by Andre Lagarmarsino

10. Is not a card carrying member of the ACLU
9. Arrives with video cam slung over shoulder.
8. Wears trench coat even during July and August.
7. Takes notes when the professor is not speaking.
6. Thinks "due process" is why the grass is wet in the morning.

5. Claims to be late because of work study job.
4. Argues that the Rosenbergs were merely making "observations" and checking on a few things.
3. Asks for directions to the PE Complex.
2. Makes frequent references to reruns of *Get Smart*.
1. Knows Brad Booke's phone number from memory.

## Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

It looks like the birds on campus are the only ones who stand up for the students. They see what we've gone through for four years and have heard our suffering, especially in the school of business.

Not only can you barely see

the letters on the front of Beam Hall because of all of the bird nests, but the droppings are disgusting. They are dripping down all the letters.

Have these letters ever been cleaned?

A concerned student.

## Boulder Dan & Dipstick Duck

by Ray Collins

ON THE OUTSKIRTS

